A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **October 8, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Quinn Peitz, Erica Dickerson, Chuck Symes and Barbara Laurie and city staff Lauren Kelly.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER
Ms. Dickerson called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

MINUTES
Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of the July 31, 2014 special meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Ms. Laurie, to approve the minutes of the August 13, 2014 meeting as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

In regard to the minutes of September 10, 2014, Ms. Dickerson said that the blue roof she'd mentioned (p. 7) is across from Pigeon Point boat landing. Ms. Laurie said that she lives adjacent to the Old Commons, which was misstated on p. 5. **Mr. Symes made a motion, second by Ms. Laurie, to accept the minutes of September 10 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.**

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS
1608 King Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 3, Parcel 227,
Alterations and Additions
Applicant: Cole Design Studio for Gary Harrell and Lora Solomon (HR14-40)
The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and additions and two new accessory structures.

This structure is in the Northwest Quadrant and is not listed in the Beaufort County 1997 Above Ground Historic Site Survey. It previously was used for commercial purposes, and the new owners want to convert it back into a residence. Most of the changes are to the site, but some are to the front:

- Replace the front stoop and cover it with a trellis
- Add a screened porch and a deck in the rear
- Add a covered porch in the rear – future phase
- Change and replace door/windows in the rear
- Add a potting shed and a garage and carport in the rear – future phase
- The applicants have a permit to remove a significant amount of asphalt in the front yard, replace it with sod, and reconfigure the parking arrangement.

- Building-related changes are being considered.

Paul Cole said the rear decks would just be decks; they would be covered and screened at a later date. They are building the foundation for the covered porch now.

Ms. Kelly said the net total improvements are 124 square feet of front porch, 400 square feet of deck, 120 square feet potting shed, and the enclosed portion of deck will be 80'. The Preservation Manual Supplement, Ms. Kelly said, says that accessory structures must be subordinate to and complementary with the main structure, and as far to the rear as possible. Decks are inappropriate on front or side facades, and must have screening from the street when they are on the back. Ms. Kelly said the building would block this deck.

- An elevation is required for new windows and doors in the rear, and specifications for windows.
- An elevation of the covered porch in the rear will be required prior to final approval. This can be approved at the staff level in the future.
- Complete elevation drawings for the future proposed garage and carport will be required for final approval, and this will require a full board review.

Staff recommends preliminary approval of the overall site plan, including all future phases and recommends final approval to the Phase 1 items, including the front porch pergola, potting shed, rear decks, and window/door replacement, contingent on staff approval of the final rear elevation.

Ms. Kelly said she's pretty sure this was built in the 1970s. **Maxine Lutz** said Historic Beaufort Foundation is happy to see the project happen. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Symes, to accept the project as submitted. The motion was approved unanimously.**

<u>910 Wilmington Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 242,</u>
New Construction
Applicant: Christina Wilson, Owner (HR14-41)
The applicant is requesting approval to construct a 12 x 21 metal carport.

Consideration of this application was tabled because the applicant was not present at the meeting.

<u>511 Prince Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 556,</u>
Renovation/Additions
Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for John & Bonnie McCardell (HR14-42)
The applicant is requesting renovation of the area under the front porch and adding windows and doors.

Ms. Kelly said this very significant building, known as the Robert Smalls house, is listed as contributing and is circa 1834. The applicant wants to infill the porch foundation – which is currently filled with wood and screened – replacing that with stucco and windows to make the portion under the porch more habitable; the interior is habitable on that level.

In regard to applicable guidelines, Ms. Kelly said that the Preservation Manual Supplement continuous masonry infill of piers is prevalent but it isn't recommended and should be removed because it accelerates deterioration. Where it exists and can remain in place, however, it should be masked with painting and a wood grill, or by adding stucco and planting. The applicant is choosing the latter option, adding windows and painting the stucco.

The house is located in a flood zone, and building code review was done, Ms. Kelly said. It's a habitable use. The sides have been infilled already with windows and brick. Staff feels that given the significance of the structure, infilling with stucco does not seem as appropriate as softening it with a wood grill, rather than stucco, around the windows, but what the applicant wants to do is a recommendation in the supplement, so it could be approved. Staff recommends that the Board discuss if the infill is appropriate and give final approval with the applicant considering modifying the exterior treatment.

Mr. Symes said Historic Beaufort Foundation has an exterior façade easement on the property. Chairman Newman asked Ms. Lutz what she thought "because it won't matter what (the Board thinks)." Ms. Lutz said they are in favor of some exterior changes: the present piers maintained, infill done with brick to duplicate the current infill brickwork for a uniform appearance, and the deck waterproofed in such a way that the appearance of the porch isn't changed.

Chairman Newman asked what "habitable" means. **Jeremiah Smith** said it has a concrete floor and lighting currently. Chairman Newman said it's "a crawl space under the house." He asked if the owners are aware of the insurance implications since it's below the flood elevation; the entire house will be rated as being under flood elevation. Mr. Smith said there's a bedroom and bathroom down there, and the owners are aware. Chairman Newman said his insurance company insured him for years, and then they sent someone to look at his home, and his rates "went way up."

Mr. Peitz asked if the family will use the downstairs area, and Mr. Smith said yes. The existing floor is lower than the dirt, but the new part will be the same as the existing floor. Mr. Peitz asked if they agree with Ms. Lutz about recommendations, and Mr. Smith said yes.

Chairman Newman asked why, if there's an easement on the property, the applicants have to come to the Historic District Review Board at all. "There's nothing to vote on," he said, because they have to comply with Historic Beaufort Foundation's requirements

and then it will be a staff approval. Historic Beaufort Foundation is the guardian of an easement and is assigned to protect the structure. If it's not protected properly, Chairman Newman said, "The feds can take that easement away." Ms. Kelly said any property in the Historic District has to come before the Board as part of "a system of checks and balances": if Historic Beaufort Foundation made a recommendation that the Board didn't agree with, then Historic Beaufort Foundation would want to hear about it. Both groups need to agree that it's an appropriate solution. Chairman Newman said Mr. Smith should make the modifications agree with Historic Beaufort Foundation requirements, and then get staff approval. Mr. Smith said the only difference in their application and the Historic Beaufort Foundation recommendation is that white stucco would be white brick instead. **Mr. Peitz moved to approve that recommendation, and Ms. Dickerson seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.**

Chairman Newman said Ms. Kelly should be done with the application before it ever comes to the Board when there's an easement on it. Mr. Peitz said they could vote to disagree with Historic Beaufort Foundation; Chairman Newman said they can state an opinion *if they feel the recommendation doesn't compl*y, so they need for it to comply first, then it should come to the Board. Ms. Lutz said it came to be on the agenda before they realized it was. Sometimes owners don't read their deeds, and "that must be what happened." Chairman Newman asked if the easement was noted in the files. Ms. Kelly said usually yes, but she didn't check it. Chairman Newman said when Ms. Kelly knows it has an easement, she can recommend what the Board should do.

809 King Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 1025,
New Construction
Applicant: CGBS Residential, LLC for (HR14-43)
The applicant is requesting construction of a new single-family dwelling.

This is the third of the 3 vacant parcels that were part of the subdivided Baptist Church of Beaufort property swap with the city. The Board has approved 805 and 807 King Street. The buildings on it have been demolished for 10 years. There are 1700 heated square feet with 242 square feet of covered porch for a single-family dwelling. It meets all of the setback requirements. Ms. Kelly went over the applicable considerations in the Supplement. In regard to siting, staff assumed from previous discussions that the parking area would be gravel and calculated 32% impervious surface.

The block has predominantly two-story cottages with south facing porches, Ms. Kelly said, and there is a mix of one- and two-story houses in the Old Commons neighborhood. Staff feels the scale is appropriate and meets the Supplement's intent. All of the elements – the first floor elevation, the five-bay façade, three-bay porch, vertical massing, etc. – are in keeping with the Supplement, so staff recommends approval. Ms. Kelly said they have been working with the applicant for a few months because of a rear easement. It started as one-story, she added, but was too big on the lot, so it evolved to two stories.

Ms. Kelly indicated where the property line had moved. Mr. Peitz asked if the Board approved a preliminary elevation. Chairman Newman said, “Not all (three) of them,” and “this one was a blank.” Chairman Newman said they reviewed a preliminary site plan for subdividing the property to suggest how the sites might develop.

Ms. Kelly said there’s a large magnolia in the back, and due to the preferences of magnolias, it wouldn't withstand the level of stress from construction, and it is in the middle of the property. Ms. Lutz said that the last time they had talked about a full porch across the facade. **Andy Banks**, builder, said there was “not a consensus in the room,” and what they have in the drawings is what the owners wanted. Ms. Lutz said the rear elevation has no openings; the floor plan may dictate walls there. Mr. Banks said the center area that sticks out is a stairwell. There was a window over the toilet in the right hand corner, and it ended up coming around the corner to help with the side elevation. Ms. Lutz said she remembered that **Mike Rainey** had been concerned “about the backs of these houses.”

Ms. Kelly said the consensus on the magnolia tree was that it couldn't be saved. It wouldn't tolerate the parking, according to the certified arborist. Mitigation isn’t required for residential properties, she added.

Chairman Newman said he, too, thinks that the rear elevation is “pretty grim.” He suggested windows in the left and right bathrooms. He’d like to suggest they flip the shower and the toilet and put a window in the rear. It would “eliminate the scrunched window,” and the side elevation is close to a neighbor and will probably be covered in blinds, anyway. Chairman Newman said it would look nice if in the lower bathroom, the toilet and shower were flipped, and a window could go above the toilet. A similar window could be on the other side that wouldn't look right at the neighbors, giving a window in each bathroom and making the rear elevation better. Chairman Newman said he thinks the porch all the way across would really help the house be a lot better; because there’s no yard to speak of, “that’s your yard.”

Mr. Peitz asked the depth of the porch. Mr. Symes said it would blend better if it were all the way across. Mr. Banks said the bays aren’t too expensive, but if you go back to what they had envisioned, the owners “have bit off all the increase they can.” Chairman Newman said it “would play better with all 3 neighbors,” and a full porch would make “a significant difference for the way it looks and for the way it lives for them.” He told Mr. Banks that he strongly encourages the porch and the windows in the back. Mr. Symes added that “it would be more livable.” Chairman Newman said, “This much infill with these houses is a big deal.” Mr. Banks said if the Board were to say, “Do it,” he’d “sell it.” **Mr. Peitz made a motion to accept the application as submitted with the addition of a porch running the full length of the first floor, pulling a window around, and adding one to the rear. Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.**

Mr. Banks clarified with Ms. Kelly that this would be a staff-level approval.

This next project is eligible for the Bailey Bill, and it has to be concurrent, Ms. Kelly said. **Chairman Newman made a motion to amend the agenda to review the update of the Bailey Bill in preparation for the next agenda item. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.**

BAILEY BILL UPDATE

Ms. Kelly said this would allow jurisdictions such as the city and county to adopt their own bill to freeze property taxes on buildings that are restored if they meet certain requirements. Both the city and county have approved this. If a property owner invests a minimum of 75% of the assessed value of the building, the assessed value of the property is frozen at the pre-rehab value for 10 years. The incentive is that the owner won't have to outlay money for both the restoration and property taxes. The property will be reassessed after 10 years.

Chairman Newman said the value of property is the value of the land *and* the building on it. He asked if the land assessment is also frozen. Ms. Kelly said the whole thing is frozen, but the amount that has to be invested is only relative to the structure.

Criteria

- The property must be located in the Historic District and be at least 50 years old, but it doesn't have to be contributing.
- Or the property can be on the Historic Site Survey but located outside the Historic District. These types of properties but have to come before the Historic District Review Board to be eligible.

Ms. Kelly said rehabbing the original structure is what qualifies. Mr. Smith's project includes the addition of a guesthouse eventually, but all that qualifies is the original structure, not building an addition.

Mr. Peitz said the Historic District Review Board is part of the criteria now. Ms. Kelly said a Bailey Bill project has to be reviewed by the Board and the expenditures approved. Mr. Peitz said a property owner "presumably wouldn't get past the staff...so the Board's goal is the same...and then it goes to the tax assessor." Ms. Kelly said the only difference in the Board's role is that sometimes the projects require interior work, and they don't need to do a detailed review, but they "would be aware of it." The Board will say, for example, "I think this is a good project," or "I don't approve the tearing out of a historic mantle," for example. A significant amount of the investment can be interior, and that qualifies. Ms. Kelly said her goal is to work through that pat of the projects, so the Board isn't overburdened.

Ms. Kelly said the applicant has to go to the pre-application conference, then go to the Historic District Review Board and fill out the Bailey Bill preliminary review application. A

project will get preliminary Bailey Bill approval when the Board approves it. Someone might have to come back to the Historic District Review Board but would have a standing Bailey Bill application. Ms. Kelly said that Columbia, Greer and Aiken have this program, and this program is modeled on that. When a project is approved, Ms. Kelly said, the owner signs a memorandum of understanding and agrees to the stipulations. If the applicant changes anything without permission, it could jeopardize the tax freeze.

The Bailey Bill final review form is done and reviewed, and there are reviews during construction, as well. When the project is finished, the tax assessor gets a form, and then the property owner is done for ten years, Ms. Kelly said. This is transferrable if the property is sold within the ten-year period.

Ms. Kelly said she tried to consolidate the application form to avoid redundancy, but the Bailey Bill is a little more detailed. Ms. Kelly said this first Bailey Bill project isn't contributing, which makes it a little easier.

1107 West Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 100,
Alterations, Additions, New Construction, Minor Demolition
Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Jeremiah & Emily Smith (HR14-44)
The applicant is requesting renovations of an addition to existing house and new construction of a guesthouse (ADU) and future garden house.

It's estimated that this building is circa 1920, and it has been significantly altered. The applicant is proposing to renovate the structure and construct a guesthouse and then a garden house.

Sorry about this line! I don't know where it came from or how to get rid of it!

In regard to zoning, Ms. Kelly said there are no issues. The addition is 450 square feet, and the guesthouse is 384 square feet. In regard to applicable guidelines for the porch, it has been screened in and altered and the applicant wants "to restore it to its traditional Beaufort character."

Ms. Kelly reviewed the Supplement discussion of secondary structures, and said the ordinance for accessory dwelling units would apply. Staff feels the proposals are a great improvement for this structure and the neighborhood in general. She noted that there's an overhead power line in the middle of the driveway.

Ms. Kelly commented that Mr. Smith will need to raise the finished floor height on the guesthouse 18". An ordinance to this effect is going through now. In regard to the garden house, staff feels it should be made more in keeping with the garden as opposed to another accessory structure with a slightly different articulation.

Mr. Peitz asked about the location of the garden house. Ms. Kelly said the Preservation Manual says that accessory dwellings should be in the rear of the property. She feels that if it were tied more to the garden, it wouldn't be an accessory structure: it would be more of a garden element. It is behind a large tree. Mr. Peitz said he likes what Mr. Smith is doing, but he has a problem with it being so close to the street. He's curious about how other Board members feel; it "seems like a little bit of an aberration" for what is normally done, he said. Mr. Peitz added that he's concerned about the double door, too, "for such a small, narrow building in front." He thinks it's not proportional. He feels a single door would be better. He thinks the windows and bringing in light is a good idea.

Mr. Smith said he's open to recommendations. Mr. Symes asked about a smaller double door. Mr. Smith said that's not what's drawn, but it's a good suggestion. Mr. Symes asked about the garden house in front, and he's a little concerned about its location, too. On the guesthouse, he asked, if they raise it 18", if it will be taller than the main structure, and if they will then need to lower the roof. Mr. Smith said that was his only concern about raising it, but otherwise, he has no concern. Mr. Symes asked if it's an issue if an outbuilding has a higher roofline. Chairman Newman said generally it is an issue. If the guesthouse had a plate line like the main house, he said, the floor could go up and leave almost everything else as it is now. Mr. Smith said the overhang on the front might be a conflict. Chairman Newman said the language is in the main house. He feels "the potting shed could be scrunched down and be a shed roof in one direction." He thinks the idiosyncrasies make neighborhoods interesting, so just because there's not another one around it, is no reason not to approve this. Its "appealing," he feels. If they build it, and there's a garden in there, there's ample opportunity to see it from the street, and that will enhance the neighborhood. Chairman Newman thinks if the garden house were "a little more modest," it "would make the house grander." He said Mr. Smith "should seek balance." Chairman Newman added that two narrower doors like Mr. Symes had suggested "could be real appealing."

Ms. Dickerson said she likes the privacy of the garden shed. Chairman Newman said the fence is a critical element to make it integral. He reiterated that what Mr. Smith is doing is "very appealing." Mr. Peitz asked if the shed could be at the same setback as the main house. Ms. Dickerson said she feels that "the variation makes it interesting." Chairman Newman said he doesn't think that would improve it.

Ms. Lutz asked if the shed couldn't go to the left because of the driveway. Ms. Dickerson said with the driveway and the fence, "they will relate to one another when it's finished." It's ahead of the main body of the house, but not the porch. Chairman Newman said the 3-D element of trees make a huge difference in the way things are perceived and the streetscape. Mr. Smith said the garden house might not be built right away; it "depends on the money that comes in." Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation "totally welcomes the project."

Chairman Newman said if the roof doesn't exceed its current height, Mr. Smith needs to raise the floor, but not raise the roof when he does it. The total width of the front door is 5'4", Mr. Smith said. He will try to keep the door(s) between the columns. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion to approve the application if the guesthouse roof doesn't go above the main roof and with scaling the doors to go within the columns' width. Mr. Peitz seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.**

DISCUSSION: CARPORTS

Though the application for a metal carport in the Northwest Quadrant was tabled, Ms. Lutz requested that the matter of carports be brought up for discussion. Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation doesn't want to see metal structures in the Historic District. They are in the Northwest Quadrant and the Old Commons, "and there are a lot of them," many of which she described as "abandoned, rusted out hulks, not even in use."

Ms. Lutz said she'd asked Ms. Kelly about getting rid of these carports, especially those that are abandoned. The Preservation Committee had the idea to come up with a model of a wooden carport, and the committee was interested in establishing a fund for mini-grants to award to people to do a carport with wood. The applicants could make up the difference in cost.

Ms. Dickerson said she hates to say no to a metal carport when the applicant is surrounded by other metal buildings, and she feels the applicant "should be applauded for doing it right" and coming to the Historic District Review Board. Ms. Kelly said she had gone to the metal carport place to see what the applicant proposed to purchase, and they make wooden sheds there. Ms. Kelly asked how much it would be to make a carport out of wood, and she was told it would be $2000. An aluminum carport would be $600, so they are looking to see if they can help with some of the difference. They are looking for a prototype, and if they could get materials donated, that would help. If the applicant's project had come to the Board, they would ask if she could wait until they can see if a fund can be established. Ms. Dickerson said that is in the Northwest Quadrant guidelines, but it hasn't been happening.

Mr. Peitz said maybe an age requirement/ time factor for the main structure could keep CPs from proliferating everywhere. Buildings built prior to the twentieth century in the Historic District would not be eligible for one, but it could be appropriate for houses that were built after the turn of the century. Ms. Lutz said that HBF needs to discuss it further and consider all the ramifications.

Ms. Laurie said, "In this lady's neighborhood...there are so many larger concerns than CPs." She's glad there's something being discussed to assist the applicant, because "it's like she's being punished for doing the right thing." Ms. Laurie would like to hear "the process for pulling these things together." Ms. Laurie said over the years, things have been done to give assistance to people in the Northwest Quadrant, and a lot of people

could benefit help keeping their properties up, which “is hard when there are these guidelines,” and the more of them there are, “the harder it is for people to do” them.

Ms. Dickerson said people in the Northwest Quadrant can qualify to do the Bailey Bill rehab; Ms. Laurie said yes, but they have to have the capital. Ms. Kelly said over the last 15 years, all of the investment in individual properties adds up to $1 million, but that money isn’t available anymore, and city staff is actively looking for solutions to that.

Chairman Newman said he had received “a lovely letter” from a property owner on Greene Street who had come before the Board and “was given a solution.” He asked if Ms. Lutz had received a copy. She had not. Chairman Newman said he would send it to the Board and Ms. Lutz. The property owners in question have said they want to remove the porch and railing to complete the agreement, but the letter was a “diatribe...extremely ugly and libelous.”

Ms. Kelly said the city and the property owner went to circuit court, and the owner requested a jury trial and tried to negotiate a way to keep the railing, “but it was impossible.” They’re taking it down in mid-November, so the matter won’t go to trial.

Reminder: the November HDRB meeting will be held on the 19th at 2 pm in the Planning Conference Room

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Newman adjourned the meeting at 3:24 p.m.